



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,690	09/23/2003	Hilliard Siegel	121685	1033
26389	7590	11/21/2005		EXAMINER
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			DESIRE, GREGORY M.	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/668,690	SIEGEL ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Gregory M. Desire	2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication filed 8/26/05.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10, 15-21, 24-38, 40-41 and 44-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell (6,701,350) in view of Cover et al (6,961,905).

Regarding method claim 1 Mitchell discloses,

Acquiring a page of content (note col. 2 line 43, web page examiner interprets as page of content);

Identifying one or more features in the page that are to be suppressed or not to be suppressed (note col. 2 lines 42-43, examiner interprets selecting of text portion as identifying a feature in the page to be suppressed); and

Preparing a substitute page that only includes images of the identified features that are not to be suppressed (note col. 2 lines 39-45, examiner interprets the filtering or omitting of selected region results in substitute page image).

Although web page contents include images, Mitchell does not clearly disclose an image of the web page. Cover discloses displaying and importing images (note col.

4 lines 57-67, importing page data i.e. spreadsheets). Mitchell and Cover are combinable because they disclose web page contents. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include importing an image of a page in the system of Mitchell as evidenced by Cover. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been referencing markup code with image files (note col. 4 lines 65 - col. 5 line 2).

Regarding claim 2 Mitchell discloses,

Acquiring page content comprises scanning a page of content into an electronic format (note col. 3 lines 23-29, lines cite scan page content).

Regarding claim 3 Mitchell discloses,

Acquiring an image of a page of content comprises converting electronic text into an electronic format (note fig. 1 block 104 and col. 2 lines 59-60, source document included test data).

Regarding claim 4 Mitchell discloses,

Acquiring an image of a page of content comprises retrieving a page that was previously stored in a memory (note col. 4 lines 4-16).

Regarding claim 5 Mitchell discloses,

Features that are not to be suppressed include determining location and size information for the features in the page that meet a non-suppression criterion (note col. 2 lines 46-52, web page excludes suppressed features).

Regarding claim 6 Mitchell discloses,

The non-suppression criterion identifies text in the page (note col. 2 lines 46-52, web page excludes suppressed features).

Regarding claim 7 Mitchell disclose,

The non-suppression criterion identifies text that matches one or more specified terms (note col. 2 lines 46-52, web page excludes suppressed features).

Regarding claim 8 Mitchell discloses,

The non-suppression criterion identifies a non-text object (note col. 2 lines 46-52, excludes suppressed features).

Regarding claim 9 Mitchell discloses,

The non-text object has text associated therewith and the non-suppression criterion identifies the non-text object by reference to the objects associated text (note col. 2 lines 46-52 excludes suppressed features remaining information left).

Regarding claim 10 Mitchell discloses,

Preparing a substitute page comprises generating a blank image and using the location and size information to copy one or more images of the non-suppressed features from the original page image to the blank image (note col. 6 lines 46-52, blank zone).

Regarding claims 15 and 40 Mitchell discloses,

Preparing a substitute page comprises removing image information from the original page image that fails to correspond to the features that are not to be suppressed (note col. 2 lines 44-45, removes undesirable features).

Regarding claims 16 and 41 Mitchell discloses,

Preparing a substitute page comprises removing image information from the original page image that corresponds to the feature that is to be suppressed (note col. 2 lines 44-45, filtered images are suppressed features).

Regarding claim 17 Mitchell discloses,

Identifying features that are to be suppressed includes determining location and size information for the features in the page image that meet a suppression criterion (note col. 2 lines 48-55, templates filter scripts)

Regarding claim 18 Mitchell discloses,

The suppression criterion identifies text in the page image (note col. 2 lines 59-61).

Regarding claim 19 Mitchell discloses,

The suppression criterion identifies text that does not match one or more specified terms (note col. 3 lines 30-35, keyword are specified terms).

Regarding claim 20 Mitchell discloses,

The suppression criterion identifies a non-text object (note col. 3 lines 53-65, geometric area and advertisement are non-text objects).

Regarding claim 21 Mitchell discloses,

The non-text object has text associated therewith and suppression criterion identifies the non-text object by reference to the object's associated text (note col. 3 lines 53-65).

Regarding claims 24 and 44 Mitchell discloses,

Storing the substitute page in a page image database for later retrieval (note col. 4 lines 4-10, cites retrieval of web page).

Regarding claims 25 and 45 Mitchell discloses,

A stored substitute image, when retrieved, constitutes an original page image that is subject to further suppression by (1) identifying one or more features in the retrieved page image that are to be suppressed or not to be suppressed, and (2) preparing a substitute page image that only includes images of the identified features that are not to be suppressed (note col. 2 lines 40-50).

Regarding claims 26 and 36 Mitchell discloses,

Referring to an access rule that limits an amount of the content that can be included in the substitute page image, and determining information for features in the page image that can remain in the page image in accordance with the access rule (note col. 2 lines 45-50, filter script limits amount included in page image).

Regarding claims 27 and 37 Mitchell discloses,

Determining information for features that can remain in the page image includes determining location and size information of the features (note fig. 1 block 104, source document).

Regarding claims 28 and 38 Mitchell discloses,

Preparing a substitute page image comprises generating a blank image and using the location and size information to copy pixel information for the features that can remain into the substitute page image at the same locations as in the original page image (note col. 2 line 51-52, Blank zone).

Regarding claim 29 Mitchell discloses,

The access rule defines an aggregate amount of content that can be included in the substitute page image (note col. 2 lines 50-60 URL includes aggregate amount of contents).

Regarding claim 30 Mitchell discloses,

The access rule defines a percentage of content that can be included in the substituted page image (note col. 2 lines 50-60).

Regarding claim 31 Mitchell discloses,

The access rule defines the amount of content based on content-specific information (note col. 2 lines 50-60).

Regarding claim 32 Mitchell discloses,

The access rule defines the amount of content based on content ownership (note (note col. 2 lines 40-45, users selecting shows ownership).

Regarding claim 33 Mitchell discloses,

Referring to different access rules based on the location of a user (note col. 2 lines 49-52, user refers web page).

Regarding claim 34 Mitchell discloses,

Referring to different access rules based on the times at which the substitute page image is to be provided to a user (note col. 2 lines 45-60).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 11-14, 22-23, 39 and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell and Cover et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bates et al (6,809,741).

Regarding claims 11 and 39 Mitchell as modified is silent disclosing,

Copying images of the non-suppressed features comprises copying pixel information for the non-suppressed features from the original page image to the substitute page image at one or more locations corresponding to the location of the non-suppressed features in the original page image. However, Bates discloses examining web pages through browser displaying local copying of an original image (note col. 5 lines 23-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to copy image in the system of Mitchell.

Examining web page images would have been highly desirable feature in the extraction art due to its memory functions and Bates recognizes that examining image data would be expected when copying of images in Bates is included in Mitchell.

Regarding claims 12 and 42 Mitchell as modified discloses,

Including background image information in the substitute page image that simulates background information in the original page image (note Bates col. 5 lines 30-35).

Regarding claim 13 Mitchell as modified discloses,

Background image information is included in the substitute page image by duplicating pixel information from the background of the original page image to the background of the substitute page image (note Bates col. 5 lines 30-35)

Regarding claim 14 Mitchell as modified discloses,

Background pixel information from one or more locations in the original page image is duplicated at corresponding locations in the substitute page image and interpolated through the remainder of the substitute page image to produce background image information for the substitute page image (note Bates col. 5 lines 30-35).

Regarding claim 22 Mitchell as modified Bates discloses,

Including background image information in the substitute page image by duplicating pixel information from the background of the original page image to the background of the substitute page image (note Bates col. 5 lines 45-55, background information copied).

Regarding claims 23 and 43 Mitchell as modified discloses,

Including background image information in the substitute page image by differentiating foreground pixel information from background pixel information, and removing foreground pixel information from the substitute page image that corresponds to the features to be suppressed (note Bates col. 5 lines 45-55).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (571) 272-7449. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory M. Desire  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2627

G.D.  
November 11, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gregory M. Desire". The signature is cursive and fluid, with "Gregory" on the top line and "M. Desire" on the bottom line.